

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

O. S. MURRAY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1836.

VOL. IX.—NO. 8.

TERMS.

The VERMONT TELEGRAPH is published weekly, at \$2.00 a year, payable within four months—after four months and within eight months—after eight months and within the year \$2.50—after the close of the year, to rise in this ratio.

To companies who receive twelve or more copies in one bundle, and pay within four months, at \$1.50—after four months, to rise as above, \$1.75 within eight months &c.

Agents, who procure and pay for six subscribers, are entitled to the seventh copy gratis.

No paper to be discontinued until arrears are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.

All letters, to secure attention, must come postage paid.

EDUCATION.

Further Extracts from Weld's Report on Manual Labor.

V.—THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF EDUCATION IS SO EXPENSIVE, THAT ITS PRACTICAL EFFECTS ARE ANTI-REPUBLICAN.

At many of our colleges the annual expense, exclusive of books and clothing, is not far from two hundred dollars; at others, one hundred and fifty; and at the cheapest, about one hundred dollars.—Who then can educate their sons at college? Not more than one family in twenty. Thus nineteen twentieths of our population are shut out from the advantages of education in the higher branches; and as knowledge is power, the sons of the rich, by enjoying advantages for the acquisition of this power vastly superior to others, may secure to themselves a monopoly of those honors and emoluments which are conferred upon the well educated. In this way society is divided into castes. The laboring classes become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the educated. The two parties stand wide asunder, no bond of companionship uniting them, no mutual sympathies interconnecting them into one mass, no equality of privileges striking a common level for both. The chasm between them, even in this republican government, already yawns deep and broad; and if it be not speedily bridged, by bringing education within the reach of the poor, it will widen into an immense gulf, and our free institutions, our national character, our bright vision of the future, our glory and our joy, will go down into it. The general and state governments have done much in order to bring education within the reach of the great mass of the people. Millions have been expended in the erection of buildings, the establishment of professorships, and in the purchase of libraries and apparatus. And what is the result? Why the wealthy can educate their sons a little cheaper than before. But education is still so expensive, that the community generally receive no benefit from such appropriations. Thus, our legislatures have in effect aided those who needed no assistance, and tantalized the needy with a show of aid so far removed, that it can never avail them. There is no benevolence in pointing a starving man to a loaf suspended in the air, unless you give him wings to fly to it. If a portion of the funds thus appropriated had been expended in furnishing the students of our institutions with the means of profitable employment during those hours each day which are not devoted to study, such appropriations would have benefited the character of a republican people, and our higher institutions; instead of meting out their blessings, as they now do, only to a favored few, would pour them equally upon all, the sun of science would not rise merely to illuminate the palace, but to gladden the hovel.

The present system is anti-republican in its practical tendencies in another respect: It makes labor disreputable. The human mind is so constituted, that it must trace relations. It would be a mental anomaly, if an impression made upon it remained, unconnected with any other object. Thoughts and feelings are intertwined in clusters, and done up in bundles. Objects connected by juxtaposition of time or place, and similarity of nature or uses, are recalled together.—When one is suggested the other appears. Apply this simple principle to the case before us. Look at our institutions of learning. There, cultivated intellect, refined taste, and extensive attainments, are connected with habits of bodily inactivity; and this connection sanctions and satisfies these habits. The learned are inactive; the unlearned labor. The former stand aloof from all the employments of common life; the latter are in the midst of them. Hence learning comes to be associated as a matter of course with inactivity, puts honor upon it, and buoys it upward; while ignorance becomes associated with labor, cleaves fast to it, sits upon it as an incubus, and crushes it into the dust. If the officers and students of all our colleges and seminaries should spend their hours of relaxation in agricultural or mechanical employments, would it not go far in redeeming labor from disgrace?

I design to notice many other particulars in which the present system of education is injurious in its influence upon the individual, and upon the community; but the discussion of these points will be reserved to another part of this communication, where the manual labor system will come under consideration, and its influence upon character will be contrasted with the effects produced by the present system.

CONTROVERSIAL.

For the Telegraph.
ATONEMENT.

Review of "M." in Nos. 49 and 50 of the eighth volume of the Telegraph.

MR. EDITOR:—It is for truth, and not for victory, that I again call the attention of your readers to the sentiments of M., as exhibited in his several communications above named, in relation to the atonement. In discussing a subject of this magnitude and character, it well becomes every man to subject his reason to the authority of inspiration, and his passions to the immutable standard of perfect judgment. And in this discussion, as in all others, the public, I am well aware, are never delighted with reciprocal recrimination, personal allusions, and abuse. Such a temper of mind is ill suited to the graver business of sober, rational and profound investigation of the great, fundamental and mysterious doctrines of divine Revelation; as well as derogatory to the christian character, and inconsistent with a christian life.

It has been well said, by an eminent English divine of the Baptist denomination, that controversy "is to be deprecated when it is directed to minute or frivolous objects; or when it is managed in such a manner as to call forth malevolent passions." That discussions of a professedly religious nature are always conducted, by professedly pious men, on the principle of self-denial, and self-sacrifice, is too lamentably and fearfully untrue.

In the present case, however, I am not about to bring the charge of a gross moral defection from the just rules of debate, against M., in his "rejoinder" to Daleth in the 49th No. of the Telegraph. This much, however, I must be allowed to say: I can not apprehend what M.'s motives could have been, in making use of the following language:

"Had Daleth read the Hebrew with points for himself, he probably would have written it *kaphar*" &c.

Now if M. has "read the Hebrew with points for himself," he knows that it does not alter the sense of the Hebrew word at all, whether it is written *copher*, or *kaphar*. Besides, well informed writers are found, who give their authority to the former orthography, as well as to the latter. It can hardly be supposed that an intelligent, and upright meaning man would throw out such language in order to produce an impression on the public mind that Daleth had written the word incorrectly, when he must have known that the word was frequently written in the manner which Daleth adopted, by a large class of linguists, especially among those who do not make use of "points" in their reading. I repeat the sentiment: I can not apprehend, what could be the motives of M. to induce him, to make use of a personal allusion in this connection. What could they have been? I will not press the answer. I will not attempt to canvass the motives of M., nor will I condemn him, unheard; and will therefore claim from him like treatment towards myself, should it ever be necessary.

In relation to the arguments advanced by M., in his "rejoinder" to Daleth, I shall now claim the attention of your readers for a few moments.

I. The translation of the Heb. word *copher*. On this subject, M. holds the following language: "He (Daleth) informs us that this Hebrew word *copher*, as he writes it, was translated into the septuagint by the Greek word *ilamos*.—In this M. thinks he is mistaken." Now whatever "M. thinks" about the matter, does not alter the fact in the case. He has not denied the position of Daleth, and much less disproved his assertion. He has not pretended to prove, that *copher*, as a noun, (which by the way, was the language of the Review,) was not translated into the septuagint by the Greek noun, *ilamos*. He has, indeed, quoted several passages, to show, where *copher*, as a verb, was translated into the septuagint by the Greek verb *ilaskomai*. But this does not prove, that *copher*, as a noun, is translated by the same Greek verb. But if M. also "thinks" that Daleth has not "investigated" the subject sufficiently on this point, I would beg leave to recommend to his critical dissection the work of John Taylor, of Norwich, (some of whose sentiments by the way abound in M.'s treatise on the atonement,) where he will find a

long list of quotations from the Hebrew and Greek, going directly to establish the point, for which I am now contending, viz: that *copher* is translated as a noun, by the Greek noun, *ilamos*. I would also recommend to his attention the remarks of Dr. Magee, on this same subject, a man who has examined the original language, in which the Hebrew word, *copher* is found, as much as some in our own country at the present day, even among those whose age and experience in the world have not been inconsiderable.

II. The rule for the use of types.

The rule of Ernesti, which M. has quoted in relation to the use of types, is an excellent rule; and one by which every theorist ought to be governed in his speculations invoking typical representation.—But how does this rule help the matter, in relation to M.'s theory? He lays down this broad, unqualified principle: "that there must be in the antitype something answering to every part of the type."—But when he is hard pressed on this theory, how does he answer "for himself?" He gravely quotes the rule laid down by the professor of theology at Leipzig, which amounts to this: so far as one object is the type of another, why, so far it is the type of another.

This, I must be allowed to say, is a sturdy defence of first principles. What declaration is a more consummate truism, than the last resort of M. in defending his method of typical reasoning? If the writer of the Essay had taken this ground in his original production (the work which I reviewed) he could not have found "a man, woman, or child" in the mountain state, that would have had the hardihood to debate the subject a moment.

But there has evidently been a shifting in this respect, since the publication of the original Essay. M. finds that his principle needs qualifying. He therefore introduces this rule for the use of types, as his original sentiment. But this rule does not favor the plan of M. He at once cuts himself off from all possibility of discovering anything by the use of his types. Why? Because, types are not types for his purpose, only so far as he knows them to be such, by antithetic proof. But if this antithetic proof is to be had, it will answer the purpose of M. as well without a type, as with a type. Hence, according to the rule of the learned professor, M. has prostrated his own favorite instrument which constituted the burden of his Essay.

III. In conclusion, I would make a single remark concerning the Essay in its new "dress." I perceive no great alteration in the work itself, except in the mode of expression. The author has apparently analyzed his peroration; and given the several reflections more prominence, in his last, than was manifest in his first edition. He has also added some thoughts in his peroration. Did my duties allow me, I should be pleased to go into an examination of some points in the Essay, which were not embraced in my first review. But I can only request the reader, to turn back to those Nos. of the Telegraph, containing a review of this Essay of M., and read them in connection; and I will not trouble you, Mr. Editor, with a reprint on the subject. DALETH.

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

Let the following article be made the right use of. Let it not lead any into the opinion—or confirm any in the opinion, where it may already have been formed—that great men, "smart men," cannot at the same time be good and useful men, and good and useful in proportion to their greatness. That all are so, we are not about to affirm. But the fact that every smart man is not a good and useful man, is no reason why every good man should not make himself as truly great and powerful as Providence designed he should do. Only let him mind that his greatness be true greatness, conjoined with goodness.

That there is such an evil in present existence as is finely hinted at by "Paul," no one who watches for the good of Zion can have failed to observe.

From the Boston Recorder.

"Churches—Preachers—Smart Men."

MR. EDITOR:—I hear much said in the churches about smart men,—men of talents, great men, powerful preachers, &c. &c., and this more particularly in reference to candidates for settlement. The questions asked by churches in want of pastors, are not, is the candidate a good man? sound in the faith? eminently pious, devoted, and active?—but, is he a

smart man? a man of talents? a popular preacher? This has become universal, from the aristocratic city congregation, with its salary of two or three thousand a year, down to the feeble society with its stipend of two or three hundred. Indeed, the feeble church, the more unwillingness is often manifested to take up with a sound, pious, faithful minister of ordinary talents. This feeling is doing immense mischief both among wealthy and feeble congregations; but more especially the latter. I have a few things to say to small churches and feeble congregations on the subject. I am not about to detract an iota from the smart men. Would to God all the Lord's prophets were ten times more gifted, provided that they were all a little more pious than smart. But then here are evils connected with having one of our present race of smart men of which feeble churches little dream. Wealthy congregations can afford to bear these evils perhaps, because they must have great men at all events; though some of them are dying under their popular preachers. But feeble churches should look well to this matter. For

1. Many who pass for smart men, are more showy than sound—more brilliant than deep. They can let off a few sermons and speeches wonderfully well, and then their pond is out.

2. Smart men are often more learned than pious, and by their levity, and worldly conformity, and want of spirituality, spoil all their Sabbath ministrations.

3. If your preacher is a smart man, very possibly you will be proud of him, and will worship your preacher more than God; and then God will blast both him and you.

4. If you obtain a smart man, most probably he will be ambitious, and soon think, that such talents as he possesses ought not to be confined to such a humble sphere.

5. If your minister is a smart man, and has the reputation of it abroad, then the larger churches and colleges will most probably entice him away. He will have call upon call, till at last he becomes satisfied that the providence of God calls him to leave. And then

6. You will find that having once had a smart man, you will not be willing to take up with any thing less than just such a smart man again. I know a small church that is now dying from this cause. It has had one or two smart men, and they have broken away suddenly; and now this church is not willing to take up with any thing much less than Dr. Beecher.

7. Many of our smart men, (I grieve to say it) do not preach the gospel plainly, pungently, fully. They sacrifice sound doctrine and faithful dealing to popularity. They wreath the sword of the spirit with so many rhetorical flowers, that it does not "pierce even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." This sacrificing at the shrine of popular applause is killing the orthodoxy and piety of many congregations. The poor leave the church because they are not led. And when God's poor leave a church for such, or for any cause, orthodoxy and piety will soon follow.

8. Smart men make churches fastidious. Like children fed on condiments, they have no relish for sound, wholesome instruction. Their gospel must come to them through a richer tube. They spurn at the "sincere milk of the word" unless it is dealt out with a silver spoon highly ornamented, and from a silver bowl set round with gems and brilliants. No preacher is popular with them, whose ministrations enlighten their understanding, mortify their vanity, humble their pride, correct their bad tempers, reprove their sloth, exalt their Savior, and make them forget the preacher in their love and admiration of his Master. But a minister is sure to be very popular with them, respecting whom they can say, "what a fine speaker," "what a fine voice," "what beautiful figures," "what eloquent sentences," "what striking illustrations," "what correct taste," "what powerful reasoning," in short, "what a charming man and preacher he is!" Thus the man is loved, praised and followed, instead of his divine Master. O how some of these smart men, swollen by the breath of human flattery, will shrivel up, when they come before the judgment seat! Feeble churches, can you afford to have a smart man!

PAUL.

A SPECIMEN OF WELCH PREACHING.

At a meeting of ministers at Bristol, England, the Rev. Mr. — invited several of his brethren to sup with him; and among them was the minister officiating at the Welch meeting house in that city. He was an entire stranger to all the company, and silently attentive to the general conversation of his brethren. The subject on which they were discussing was the different strains of public preaching. When several had given their opinions, and mentioned some individuals as good preachers, and such as were models to the style of compositions, &c., Mr. — turned to the Welch stranger and solicited his opinion. He said he felt it a privilege to be silent when such men were discoursing, but that he felt it his duty to comply with the request. But, said he, if I must give my opinion, I should say that you have no good preachers in England. No? said Mr. L. — No, said he, that is, I mean no such preachers as we have in the Prin-

cipality. I know, said Mr. L., you are famous for jumping in Wales; but that is not owing, I suppose, so much to the strain of preaching which the people hear, as to the enthusiasm of their characters. Indeed, said the Welchman, you would jump too, if you heard and understood such preaching. Why, said Mr. L., do you not think that I could make them jump if I were to preach to them! You make them jump! exclaimed the Welchman; you make them jump! A Welchman would set fire to the world while you were lighting the match. The whole company became very much interested in this new turn of the subject, and unanimously requested the good man to give them some specimen of the style and manner of preaching in the Principality.—Specimen, said he, I cannot give you: if John Ellis were here, he would give you a specimen indeed. O, John Ellis is a great preacher. Well, said the company, give us something that you have heard from him. Oh, no! said he, I cannot do justice to it—besides, do you understand the Welch language? They said no, not so far as to follow a discourse. Then, said he, it is impossible for you to understand, if I were to give you a specimen.—But, said they, cannot you put it into English? Oh! said he, your poor meagre language would spoil it; it is not capable of expressing those ideas which a Welchman can conceive. I cannot give you a specimen in English without spoiling it. The interest of the company was increased, and nothing would do but something of a specimen, while they promised to make every allowance for the language. Well, said the Welchman, if you must have a piece, I must try, but I know not what to give you. I do not recollect a piece of John Ellis; he is our best preacher; I must think a little—well, I recollect a piece of Christmas Evans.

Christmas Evans is a good preacher, and I heard him a little time ago, at an association of ministers. He was preaching on the depravity of man by sin—of his recovery by the death of Christ; and he said, brethren, if I were to represent you in a figure the condition of man as a sinner, and the means of his recovery by the Cross of Christ, I should represent it somewhat in this way—Suppose a large grave-yard, surrounded by a high wall, with only one entrance, which is by a large iron gate, which is fast bolted: within these walls are thousands and tens of thousands of human beings, of all ages, and of all classes, by one epidemic disease bending to the grave—the grave yawns to swallow them, and they must all die; there is no balm to relieve them—No physician there—they must perish. This is the condition of man as a sinner: all, all have sinned, and the soul that sinneth it shall die. While man was in this deplorable state, Mercy, the darling attribute of Deity, came down and stood at the gate, looking at the scene, and wept over it, exclaiming, O that I might enter! I would bind up their wounds, I would relieve their sorrows, I would save their souls! While mercy stood weeping at the gate, an embassy of angels, commissioned from the court of heaven to some other world, passed over, paused at the sight, and heaven forgave the pause: and seeing mercy standing there, they cried, Mercy, Mercy, can you not enter? Can you look upon this scene and not pity? Can you pity and not deliver? Mercy replied, I can see—and in her tears she added, and I can pity, but I cannot relieve. Why can you not enter? Oh! said Mercy, Justice has barred the gate against me, and I cannot, must not unbar it. At this moment Justice himself appeared, as it were, to watch the gate. The angels inquired of him, why will you not let Mercy in? Justice replied, my law is broken and it must be honored; die they, or Justice must! At this there appeared a form among the angelic band, like unto the Son of God, who, addressing himself to Justice, said, what are thy demands? Justice replied, my terms are stern and rigid. I must have sickness for their health, I must have ignominy for their honor, I must have death for life. Without shedding of blood there is no remission. Justice, said the Son of God, I accept the terms. On me be this wrong, and let Mercy enter.—When, said Justice, will you perform this promise. Jesus replied, four thousand years hence upon the hill of Calvary, without the gates of Jerusalem, I will perform it in my own person. The deed was prepared and signed in the presence of the angels of God. Justice was satisfied, and Mercy entered, preaching salvation in the name of Jesus. The deed was committed to the patriarchs, by them to the kings of Israel and prophets, by them it was preserved until Daniel's seventy weeks were accomplished. Then, at the appointed time, Justice appeared on the hill of Calvary, and mercy presented to him the important deed. Where, said Justice, is the Son of God? Mercy answered, behold him at the bottom of the hill, bearing his own cross; and then she departed and stood aloof at the hour of trial. Jesus ascended the hill, while in his train followed his weeping church. Justice immediately presented him with the deed, saying, this is the day when this bond is to be executed. When he received it, did he tear it in pieces, and give it to the winds of heaven? No, he nailed it to his cross, exclaiming, it is finished.—Justice called on holy fire to come down

and consume the sacrifice; holy fire descended—it swallowed his humanity, and when it touched his Deity, it expired! And there was darkness over the whole heavens: but glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will to man.

This, said the Welchman, is but a specimen of Christmas Evans.

MISSIONARY.

From the Bap. Missionary Magazine, Nov. 1836.
Deputation to the Missionary stations in the East.

Journal of Rev. Howard Malcom.
Continued.

Tuesday, Dec. 1. Last evening a sail was despatched directly astern, and by three o'clock this morning, she came up and spoke us, proving to be the *Tigris*, from London to Ceylon. They passed ahead, but the wind dying entirely away, they after breakfast, put off a boat, and the Capt. (Stephens.) Col. McPherson, of the Ceylon regiment, a surgeon, and several young officers, came on board. Learning from them that the Rev. Mr. Hardy and wife, Wesleyan missionaries to Ceylon, were on board, Mr. Sutton and myself with two or three of the brethren went to him, and had a pleasant interview. On returning, we found our captain had rigged my arm chair with nice strings and tackle, to the yard-arm, and was prepared to give the ladies an excursion. The two boats took them all, and they remained an hour with the ladies in the *Tigris*, during which a genteel repast was served to them.—Our first visitors remained with us, and took lunch. From Col. McPherson, who had served in the Burman war, I learned a few particulars respecting that people, and also the Shans, for whom I feel deeply interested.

During the absence of the ladies, we observed an encounter between a hump-backed whale, and a thresher. The whale seemed greatly provoked, floundering and blowing with violence, while the thresher adroitly evaded the stroke of its flukes, sometimes by leaping entirely out of the water. Presently after these combatants disappeared, four or five other whales were seen rolling and playing within one hundred yards of the ship, their backs rising five or six feet out of the water, while ever and anon, as they descended, their broad tails rose up high into view. Toward evening a breeze sprung up, the *Tigris* passed on, and we parted company with the regret of severed neighbors.

25. In latitude 37 deg. 30 min., longitude 70 deg. east. Never had a ship a finer run than ours since we left the equator. We got up to latitude 35 deg. on the twenty-third ult., being then in longitude 23 deg. west. We have thus run ninety-three degrees of longitude in thirty-three days, and have passed the Cape without the semblance of a storm. It being nearly mid-summer here, we have had mild (though damp) weather, the thermometer never sinking below 50 deg.

I had no conception that "doubling the Cape of Good Hope" meant passing by the coast of S. America to a higher latitude than the Cape, and then proceeding as near as possible in a straight line six thousand miles eastward, before we turn northward again; in the mean time not coming within one hundred and fifty or two hundred miles of the Cape. But such is the course rendered necessary by the trade-winds. Persons going to India, and leaving the United States at any time except from about the first of October to the first of January, ought to be provided with flannels for five or six weeks' use.

Having found the flesh of our porpoise an exceedingly delicate food, we have sought every opportunity to harpoon another, but without success, till yesterday, when we welcomed one on deck. All agree that they never ate more delicious meat than this, after it has been kept a day or two. It has no resemblance to fish, in appearance or taste; but when cooked, is of a dark color, like venison, and eats like the tenderest beef. The liver is very fine. This porpoise was instantly recognized as of a different species from the other, though of the kind usually caught in this region. It had a strong, thick, counter-shaped fin on the back. The light color of the belly was diffused over the back towards the tail. The other, which the sailors called Cape Horn porpoise, had no fin on the back, and was of a uniform dark color the whole length of the back. The captain assures us that the porpoises which tumble about in our bays, are quite equal to these for food. It is a pity in this case, that they are not brought to market. Being easily taken, they would form at once a cheap and delicious food, beside the advantage of the oil.

January 1, 1836. Our fine run continues. For fifty-four days past our progress has averaged one hundred and seventy-two miles a day, which is seventy miles more than the average of the first forty-five days. We now see no albatrosses, and few birds of any kind—no whales—no ships. The reflection that as I walk the deck, I can turn nowhere and look towards home—that friends and countrymen are beneath my feet, and that the thickness of the globe divides us, makes this new year's day memorable.—Absence indeed it is, when one can get no further from his country!